



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/806,907

04/06/2001

Francois Grieu

677-22

7719

23117 7590 02/10/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYTE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

KIM, AHSHIK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/806,907

Applicant(s)

GRIEU ET AL.

Examiner

Ahshik Kim

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/17/02 (Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5 and 7-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed on December 17, 2002. Claims 1, 2,

5 and 6 are canceled, claims 3-5, 7-10 and 12-16 are amended, and claim 17 is newly added.

Accordingly, claims 3-5, and 7-17 remain for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

10 basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15 2. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Feiken (US 5,635,695).

Feiken teaches a method for interchanging data between memory on a smart card and an automatic machine, the machine pertaining to devices that receive payment in exchange for goods or services (see background of invention). In operation, a user inputs the card within the
20 machine, the machine causes an account on the card is debited if a flag on the card exhibits a ratified “1” state. If the machine reads the card as having been previously debited, then the flag on the card exhibits a non-ratified “0” state, and the good or service may be delivered or performed. After delivery or performance, the flag is reset to flag to “1”. The putting of the flag into the non-ratified state is an indivisible process (see col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

5 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10 3. Claims 3 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feiken, in view of Cheung (US 6,062,472).

The teachings of Feiken have been discussed above. However, Feiken fails to teach the debiting of the card or delivery of the goods or services as dependent upon an expiry of a time
15 delay.

Cheung teaches a system for restoring a transaction in response to an interruption of the transaction. If a transaction between card 2 and card-reading device 1 is interrupted, the system attempts to recover the transaction. The device checks the card to see if a restore record flag is set. If not, authorization is requested to restore the transaction to the card. If authorization is not
20 met before a time delay expires, no money is deducted from the card, thereby ending the transaction and preventing any service from occurring (see figure 1, 3, col. 5, lines 27+).

It would have been obvious to provide the time delay/expiry feature with the card and machine of Feiken, as it decreases the amount of time a system's transaction is "in limbo", thereby decreasing the chance of unauthorized tampering and theft of secure transaction data or
25 funds. The expiration of time would more likely denote that transaction is questionable in status, and therefore needs to be terminated to ensure security.

Art Unit: 2876

4. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feiken.

The teachings of Feiken have been discussed above.

However, Feiken fails to teach a condition debiting of the card subordinate to the
5 machine performing the transaction belonging to a group to which the machine that performed
the previous transaction also belongs. This concept is notoriously well known in the art as it falls
in line with, for example, a particular ATM card, wielding a specific credit union symbol, only to
be used at a machine designated by that credit union. It is known in the industry for card
manufacturers to create machines that only operate with certain cards, the cards only able to
10 operate with the machine when the machine passes a criterion of being manufactured specifically
for that card. This concept is also known with cards used for particular vending machines, per
say, at an exclusive company or business. Thus, it would have been an obvious expedient to
include this conditional feature with the transaction practices of Feiken.

Feiken also fails to teach memory within the card as recording the type of good and
15 service being delivered during the transaction. Smart cards in the industry have the luxury of
this type of information, as they are evident when one obtains financial statements regarding
one's account. Specifically, it is well known in the art that memory within the cards does record
such data, as when an account holder or financial institution teller accesses the account
electronically at a terminal, the holder or teller sees transaction information recorded on the card,
20 the information revealing the time, date, cost, and type of good or service purchased. Thus, it
would have been obvious to add this set of data within memory on the card of Feiken.

Art Unit: 2876

5. Claims 7, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feiken, in view of Feiken (US 6,070,795, hereafter Feiken '795).

The teachings of Feiken have been discussed above. However, Feiken fails to teach information as exchanged by the card and machine as being previously encrypted by means
5 incorporated both in the card and machine.

Feiken '795 teaches a method of recovering smart card transactions with a reading device. Upon knowledge of an interruption of a transaction, the card 1 and terminal 2 exchange codes and commands regarding restoring funds to the card and terminal, the codes, commands, and funds data encrypted by means within the card (see figure 2, steps 10 and 16) and security
10 module SM in the terminal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide cryptographical means within both the card and machine of Feiken, as it helps ensure that transaction data is not lost to unauthorized persons during transaction recovery. Cryptographical means are notoriously well known in the art to be used as means for securing financial transactions between cards and
15 card readers.

6. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feiken, in view of Everett et al. (US 5,982,293).

The teachings of Feiken have been discussed above. However, Feiken fails to teach the
20 counting of occasions the flag is read in a non-ratified state, providing a threshold at which delivering of goods or services is inhibited.

Everett teaches a system for recovering a transaction between a smart card and interface device. The device, upon trying to recover an amount of funds debited from the card to the device before an interruption in transaction, sends a request to the card, hoping to recover a message from the card (this state corresponds to a non-ratified "0" state as purposed in the teachings of Feiken). This sequence is counted and repeated a predetermined number of times, stopping after no success (col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 16). This counted number may result in the stoppage of payment, and effectively, the preventing of goods or services from being delivered.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such a means of Everett. A limit to the number of attempts to recover the funds are synonymous with the above limitations of an expired time delay, as it would also provide secure means of preventing unauthorized persons from accessing secure transaction data or funds. Too many attempts at recovering funds from the card may denote to the system the high likelihood of illegal obtaining of goods or services provided by the system. Also, a high number of attempts may also denote that the card is no longer acceptable by the system, as a result of the interruption, therefore halting transactions alleviates the problem quickly.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's amendment and remarks filed on December 17, 2002 has been carefully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant incorporated the subject matter in claims 1, 2, and 6 into newly written claim 17, and argues that the amended claim now discloses that setting/resetting of the flag is

Art Unit: 2876

controlled by the card. Applicant further asserts that the reference to Feiken (US 5,635,695) teaches that such resetting/setting is performed by the card plus the machine plus central processing system (See page 6, 2nd paragraph).

In response to Applicant's argument, and in view of Feiken (col. 2, lines 22+), the flag –
5 a register or memory location – physically is located within the card. Only the central processor can physically remove or delete the flag from the card. The program, which sets or resets the flag can be loaded in EEPROM of the card (col. 2, lines 28+). In view of the above, Feiken still meets elements disclosed in amended claim.

The amended claims and remarks describing these elements have been fully considered,
10 but they are not persuasive, and therefore, the Examiner has made this Office Action final.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
15 examiner should be directed to *Ahshik Kim* whose telephone number is (703)305-5203 . The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 6:00AM to 3:00PM Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax number directly to the
20 Examiner is (703) 746-4782. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)308-7722, (703)308-7724, or (703)308-7382.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35
U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be
addressed to [ahshik.kim@uspto.gov].

25 *All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*
30

Application/Control Number: 09/806,907


Page 8

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

5 

Ahshik Kim
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2876
February 5, 2003

10 
MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800